

1 **MARTIN D. SINGER (SBN 78166)**

2 mdsinger@lavelysinger.com

3 **MICHAEL E. WEINSTEN (SBN 155680)**

4 mweinsten@lavelysinger.com

5 **MELISSA Y. LERNER (SBN 285216)**

6 mlerner@lavelysinger.com

7 **LAVELY & SINGER**

8 **PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION**

9 2049 Century Park East, Suite 2400

10 Los Angeles, California 90067-2906

11 Telephone: (310) 556-3501

12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 BIG GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC.

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 ASHA DANIELS, an Individual,

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 BIG GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC., a
20 Delaware Corporation; CAPS
21 PAYROLL, an unknown California
22 Business Organization; MELISSA
23 JEFFERSON (aka “LIZZO”), as an
24 Individual; CARLINA GUGLIOTTA, as
an Individual; AMANDA NOMURA, as
an Individual, and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

25 Defendants.

26 Case No. 2:24-cv-03571 FLA (PVCx)
27 [Hon. Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha]

28 **[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT
GRANTING DEFENDANT BIG
GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC.’S
MOTION FOR SUMMARY
JUDGMENT OR, IN THE
ALTERNATIVE, PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. #57]**

Date: August 22, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Hon. Fernando L. Aenlle-Rocha

Courtroom: 6B

On July 18, 2025 Defendant BIG GRRRL BIG TOURING, INC. (“BGBT” or “Defendant”) filed its Motion for Summary Judgment (the “Motion”). (ECF No. 57.) Defendant requests summary judgment on the basis that judgment for Defendant is appropriate as a matter of law because the uncontested facts do not establish the essential elements of Plaintiff’s seven remaining claims for relief against Defendant and, with respect to Plaintiff’s fifth claim for relief for failure to engage in the interactive process, no such stand-alone claim exists under the ADA as a matter of law.

The Court, having and considered Defendant's Motion and finding good cause therefor, hereby GRANTS the Motion and ORDERS as follows:

1. Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment is granted as to the entirety of the operative Second Amended Complaint (ECF No. 3-1 at pp. 326-73) ("SAC"), namely the following claims for relief (styled as "causes of action") asserted by Plaintiff against Defendant in the SAC: the first claim for relief for hostile work environment – sexual harassment in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 ("Title VII"); second claim for relief for racial harassment and discrimination in violation of Title VII; third claim for relief for disability discrimination in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA"); fourth claim for relief for failure to accommodate in violation of the ADA; fifth claim for relief for failure to engage in the interactive process in violation of the ADA; sixth claim for relief for retaliation in violation of Title VII; and seventh claim for relief for retaliation in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act.
2. Judgment is entered in favor of Defendant and against Plaintiff.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

FERNANDO L. AENLLE-ROCHA
United States District Judge